Attending: Scott Olson, Patricia Rogers, Scott Ellinghuysen, Gary Evans, Ken Janz, Barb Oertel, Lori Reed, Andrea Mikkelsen, Tracy Rahim, Alex Kromminga, Tania Schmidt, Brett Ayers, Kate Parsi, Nancy Peterson, Charley Opatz, Chad Kjorlien, Jill Quandt

Automated Class Cancellation System
Andrea Mikkelsen, director of public information, presented a proposed system for automating class cancellation announcements:
- University Communications is working with Information Technology to create a system to automatically collect and disseminate faculty class cancellations
- Priority is to develop a system for handling severe weather cancellations but the goal is to use the system for all class cancellations
- The system would also send information through channels other than the web, such as emails to students, text alerts, etc.

Professional & Leadership Development Task Force Proposal
ASF presented its reaction to the proposed Professional & Leadership Development Committee:
- Membership commented that the charge seemed dispersed and unfocused
- There was uncertainty if the intent was a permanent university committee or a task force
- Lori Reed commented that the focus was on creating a culture of campus civility, although she felt that Nancy Jannik desired to incorporate a broader view of leadership and employee development
- Lori feels like the task force group could work to reshape and focus the charge
- After Tracy Rahim asked if the intent was to focus on creating an environment for civility, Lori noted that there were university regulations devoted to this, and perhaps the task force could work on revising or combining those and developing leadership skills to promote an environment of civility
- Ken Janz observed that the group could also examine other university regulations related to civility

PIF Priorities
Tracy began the discussion by asking if administration continued to follow the priorities listed in university regulation for PIF decisions:
- In the new administration, decisions have generally been made on the intrinsic quality of applications and not solely on the listed priorities
- Pat Rogers observed that the listed priorities are in line with those of IFO and are common throughout the system
- Tracy noted that the PIF process is probably not a true university regulation and could be reclassified as a process
- When asked for a recommendation, ASF requested a full review and consideration of eliminating current PIF criteria as a regulation and establishing it as a university procedure; the proposed change will be on the next Meet & Confer agenda

Charting the Future Response
Tracy shared feedback on Charting the Future gathered at the October membership meeting:
- Consensus was that the document was not focused on 4-year universities and liberal arts education
President Olson commented that he believes this view is reflected statewide, and that the document may also stereotype 2-year institutions which also have diverse offerings and needs.

He continued that different groups worked separately on the priorities, so their ideas may not always mesh and form a whole.

Barb Oertel noted that the group also did not consider strategic plans that are already in place.

President Olson summarized the initiative as one that was intended to enhance service for those that the system institutions do not already serve very well.

Chancellor Rosenstone has stayed out of the process and has therefore not commented on Winona State's or other responses.

Jill Quandt commented that the MnSCU board of trustees is likely to play a role in the direction of the initiative.

A revised version of Charting the Future is due in mid-November.

All-University Committee Membership
Tracy requested proportional representation for ASF on the Enrollment Management and University Arts Collection committees, which currently have none other than ex officio membership.
President Olson responded that the request would be placed on the next Cabinet meeting agenda.
Tracy recommended adding one ASF member to the Arts Collection committee, and representation proportional to other units on Enrollment Management.

SIA Feedback
President Olson opened the discussion by noting that there had been no SIA applications this cycle and requested feedback on how interest could be encouraged:

- Tracy observed that with no designated fund, applicants may be unsure that there is support.
- Chad Kjorlein posited that many projects are conducted across departments; as processes and awards are not consistent the process becomes cumbersome and complicated.
- Jill Quandt commented that university staffing has been lean for the last few years which may have discouraged interest, although the environment seems to be improving now.
- President Olson noted that establishing a dedicated account may make things concrete, but it could stifle “big” ideas in some cases; he recommended making it clear that the funds exist and additional or discretionary funds could be available upstream for particularly meaningful projects.
- Tracy asked if there was any prospect for a renewal of a Hopes and Dreams-type initiative; administration responded that it will depend on upcoming university-wide projects and the distribution of carry-forward funds.
- It was noted that the next round of SIA begins on November 15.

Administrative Organization Chart
Administration distributed a cabinet-level organization chart that reflects the current administrative structure.
President Olson remarked that administration is currently discussing possible models for Student Life & Development; a clearer role for enrollment management will be a priority in the decision process.
Administration welcomed suggestions on administrative models and feedback on proposed models.

The next Meet & Confer is scheduled for Tuesday, November 12, at 9 a.m.
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